

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action that was mailed on June 8, 2009. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 15-19 and 26-36 were pending in that action. With the present response, claims 7, 18, 19 and 32 are amended. New claims 37 and 38 are added. Claims 1-6, 8-17, 20-31 and 33-36 are cancelled.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner noted that Applicant would seem to have forgotten to attach a reference relevant to an Information Disclosure Statement. With the present response, Applicant is submitting a new Information Disclosure Statement in order to have the relevant reference considered.

Beginning on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §112. With the present response, these claims have been cancelled.

Beginning on page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 26, 35 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §101. With the present response, these claims have been cancelled.

Beginning on page 6 of the Office Action and continuing on in the subsequent pages, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 15-19, 26-33, 35 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103 based on an alleged obviousness in view of a range of different cited prior art references. However, on page 21 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claim 34 would be allowable if re-written in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

With the present response, Applicant has cancelled all claims except for those relevant to the indication of allowable subject matter on page 21 of the Office Action. Claim 7 as amended is essentially the allowable claim 34 re-written in independent form including limitations of the base claim and intervening claims. The dependencies of claims 18, 19 and 32 have been adjusted in order to accommodate the amendment toward the allowable subject matter. It is respectfully submitted that claims 7, 18, 19, and 32 are consistent with the indication of allowable subject matter. Consideration and allowance of these claims are respectfully solicited.

New claim 37 is almost identical to the allowable claim 7 but excludes the phrase “building a lattice based upon possible pronunciations of the corrected word and the recognition

result.” It is clear from the indication of allowable subject matter that it is primarily the elements related to generation of the confidence score that make claim 34 allowable. The eliminated element related to the building of a lattice is somewhat out of the general flow of the claim. Applicant respectfully suggests that the elements of claim 37 are just as distinguishable from the cited prior art as the elements of claim 7. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 37 and 38 as being substantially similar to the indication of allowable subject matter.

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that claims 7, 18, 19, 32, 37 and 38 are in condition for allowance. Consideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited. The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

MICROSOFT CORPORATION

By: /christopher l holt/
Christopher L. Holt, Reg. No. 45,844
One Microsoft Way
Redmond, WA 98052-6399
Direct telephone (425) 707-9382

CLH:rkm